

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-6448

JOHN W. TODD, a/k/a Kristopher S. Kollyns,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MR. MCMILLAN, Former head social worker, Broad
River Correctional Institute of the SCDC;
PARKER EVATT, Commissioner, SCDC; GEORGE
MARTEN, III, Warden, BRCI; RALPH S. BEARDSLEY,
Unit Manager, BR R&E, SCDC; AL WATERS, Chief,
Internal Affairs, SCDC; BILL WHITE, Deputy
Warden, BRCI, SCDC; ROBERT BAXLEY, Investiga-
tor, BRCI, SCDC; DR. BAKER, Head doctor, BRCI,
SCDC; FITTS FREEMAN, Contraband Officer, ACI,
SCDC,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District
Judge. (CA-91-2119-3-20-BC)

Submitted: May 7, 1996

Decided: May 30, 1996

Before NIEMEYER and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges, and PHILLIPS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John W. Todd, Appellant Pro Se. Laura Callaway Hart, TURNER, PADGET, GRAHAM & LANEY, P.A., Columbia, South Carolina; Charles Elford Carpenter, Jr., Deborah Harrison Sheffield, RICHARDSON, PLOWDEN, CARPENTER & ROBINSON, Columbia, South Carolina; Jeffrey Lawrence Payne, TURNER, PADGETT, GRAHAM & LANEY, P.A., Florence, South Carolina; Benjamin Davis McCoy, HOWSER, NEWMAN & BEASLEY, L.L.C., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

John Todd appeals from the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1988) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion awarding summary judgment to eight of the nine named Defendants and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Todd v. McMillan, No. CA-91-2119-3-20-BC (D.S.C. Nov. 15, 1993). With respect to Todd's claim against defendant McMillan, we have reviewed the record and the proceedings before the district court and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED